# E-filing

### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## ALISE MALIKYAR and ROBERT JACOBSEN,

Plaintiffs,

No. C 07-03533 WHA

JOHN SRAMEK, BERNADETTE SRAMEK, HAROLD M. JAFFE, JOHN S. SRAMEK AND BERNADETTE SRAMEK REMOVABLE LIVING TRUST AND DOES 1 TO 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

### SPECIAL VERDICT FORM

Your answers to the following questions must be unanimous:

1. Have plaintiffs proven by a preponderance of the evidence that any defendant violated the federal wiretapping law?

Harold Jaffe Yes No V

John Sramek Yes No V

Bernadette Sramek Yes No V

2. Have plaintiffs proven by a preponderance of the evidence that any defendant violated California state wiretapping law?

3. Have plaintiffs proven by a preponderance of the evidence that any defendant violated the state law against invasion of privacy?

IF YOU UNANIMOUSLY ANSWER "NO" TO ALL OF THE FOREGOING, THEN YOU ARE DONE, GO TO THE END, AND SIGN AND DATE THE FORM AND ADVISE THE DEPUTY MARSHAL THAT YOU HAVE REACHED A VERDICT.

4. If the answer to any of the foregoing questions is "Yes," then you must state the amount of actual damages, if any, proven by plaintiff Alise Malikyar, keeping in mind the specific categories of damages eligible for your consideration as set forth in the instructions. Answer the following question:

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	***************************************
21	***************************************
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	I

28

1

Plaintiff Ali	se Malikyar asse	rts a cla	im for emo	tional distres	ss due to alleg	ged interception
of attorney-client te	lephone calls. If	you fin	nd that any s	uch intercep	tion of attorn	ey-client
telephone calls by d	efendants has be	en prov	en, then sta	te the amour	nt of emotions	al distress
damages you find ha	ave been proven	due to	such interce	ption; other	wise, state "N	ONE."
		\$		_		
5. No o	ther actual dama	ge item	has been su	ibmitted for	your consider	ration but the
federal statutes in qu	uestion allow the	judge 1	to impose a	statutory da	mage award i	n the amount of
\$100 a day per day	(up to a maximu	m of \$1	0,000) for a	ny proven v	iolations. If y	you have found
any defendant violar	ted the federal w	iretappi	ing statute, s	state the num	iber of days p	proven for any
such wiretap.						
				DAYS		
6. If you	u find a violation	on any	claim here	in, you must	consider furt	her whether
plaintiffs have prove	en that any such	defenda	ints' conduc	t was malici	ous or in recl	kless disregard
of plaintiffs' rights s	so as to warrant a	ın awar	d of punitiv	e damages.	Have plaintif	fs proven that
they are entitled to p	ounitive damages	?	,	•		
Haro	ld Jaffe	Yes	-	No		
John	Sramek	Yes		No	<del></del>	
Berna	adette Sramek	Yes		No	·	
If your answ	er to Question N	o. 6 is '	'Yes," then	a short supp	lemental proc	reeding will
take place for you to	decide the amor	unt of p	unitive dam	ages.		٠.

#### **CONCLUSION**

ONCE YOU HAVE FINISHED ANSWERING THE NECESSARY QUESTIONS UNANIMOUSLY, PLEASE HAVE THE FOREPERSON SIGN AND DATE THIS FORM. THEN CONTACT THE DEPUTY MARSHAL TO INFORM HIM OR HER THAT YOU HAVE COMPLETED YOUR DELIBERATIONS.

Dated: 6(22/09

Fira & Bulkhari FOREPERSON